

To: Stan Kaczmarek[StanK@demaximis.com]; Hoppe, Michael[Hoppe.Michael@epa.gov]
From: Vaughn, Stephanie
Sent: Fri 9/13/2013 3:45:20 PM
Subject: RE: Water data for website

I think the wrong reports were uploaded – the new water language and the detection limits in the air report are not there. Please check.

Thanks

From: Stan Kaczmarek [mailto:StanK@demaximis.com]
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2013 11:29 AM
To: Hoppe, Michael; Vaughn, Stephanie
Subject: RE: Water data for website

Stephanie, the production reports were posted yesterday. It is part 2 of postings that were put up yesterday, with the first part being a statement of our support for the Coast Guard in resolving the issues surrounding Bridge Street Bridge. Scroll down just a little on the News and Update section and the links to the monitoring reports for last week can be seen.

Agree that once we have a resolution from the Coast Guard, we will know where to focus our efforts on documentation, etc.

Stan Kaczmarek, PE

de maximis, inc.

186 Center Street, Suite 290

Clinton, NJ 08809

(O) (908) 735-9315

(C) (973) 978-9621

>>> On 9/13/2013 at 11:25 AM, in message
<277c3eb49b2b4ff8bbda61b72b88ebb3@BL2PR09MB017.namprd09.prod.outlook.com>, "Vaughn, Stephanie" <Vaughn.Stephania@epa.gov> wrote:

Still no news on the bridge. I'm going to send the commander another email early this afternoon if we don't hear anything.

Once we know the path forward, it will be easier to focus our planning conversations. It certainly is on everyone's mind.

Stan – I just noticed that the weekly air, water and production reports aren't up on the website yet. Please post them, as I believe we said they were posted at the meeting last night.

Thanks

From: Hoppe, Michael
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2013 10:50 AM
To: Vaughn, Stephanie; Stan Kaczmarek
Subject: RE: Water data for website

Stephanie/Stan,

As I continue to go through emails, I concur with Stephanie's assertions regarding the sampling frequencies. I will admit that I mentioned the possibility of 1 COPC round of air samples per 12 days (well 1 per 2 weeks of "work"), but understand that we must not vary much with the approved plan. The idea is to still have comprehensive air monitoring/sampling, but lessening the overall burden.

Any encouraging bridge news? I ask because (again) we need to establish a contingency for delays beyond 30-days and potential for weather shutting operations down for the season should we go beyond December. I'm sure it's on everyone's mind, but I'm looking for long term perspective.

Mike

Michael Hoppe

Federal On-Scene Coordinator

USEPA Region 2

Response and Prevention Branch

Preparedness Section

Phone: (732) 906-6908 Fax: (732) 321-4425

Cell: (908) 420-4472



From: Vaughn, Stephanie
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2013 11:46 AM
To: Stan Kaczmarek; Hoppe, Michael
Subject: RE: Water data for website

Hi Stan,

Here are my comments:

PAMP Plan modification – it is not appropriate at this point to modify the actual plan, as this was already approved. Any changes to the plan should be done as a field modification or separate memo (or something similar). That said, I don't think I can agree with most of the changes you are proposing.

First, the approved plan states that after review of the initial data, it is anticipated that the frequency of COPC sampling will be able to be reduced to 1 time per week. I'm not sure where once every 12 days came from, but this is too low of a frequency.

Second, the approved plan includes 2 to 6 days of increased monitoring frequency when the zone of 28+00 to 21+00 is reached. This increased sampling is based on the fact that there are higher COPC concentrations in this area, and thus we want to make sure that the higher concentrations do not lead to unacceptable air concentrations. This requirement cannot just be abandoned at this point, but I do think that only 2 days of increased monitoring frequency are needed. Since COPCs should be sampled once per week anyway, this is only 1 additional round of samples.

Finally, I am open to discussing decreasing the sampling frequency further during capping. But let's hold off on making a decision on that until we evaluate at least another round or two of results.

Water Quality Data – what if instead of saying that operations were conducted within acceptable water quality limits, we say "Operations did not adversely affect water quality." Then change the summary at the beginning to state:

Water quality monitoring for this project began on June xx to establish pre-dredging, baseline conditions. Dredging operations, which began on August 3, 2013, are being continuously monitored to ensure that water quality remains similar to the pre-dredging conditions that were determined. Results shown in this report should be compared to either the non-dredging periods (for turbidity) or the pre-dredging results (for the composite data). Note that there is natural

variability in water quality, which is reflected in the data you see below. The sampling locations are shown on the map at the end of this report.

We can discuss the exact wording of this summary, but I think a bit more information here will help people better understand what they are looking at.

PAMP Data – for the air report, can you add the detection limits to the results, instead of just saying nd? This can be done either in the table or as a footnote to the table.

Thanks,

Stephanie

From: Stan Kaczmarek [mailto:StanK@demaximis.com]

Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2013 8:12 PM

To: Hoppe, Michael; Vaughn, Stephanie

Subject: Water data for website

Mike and Stephanie,

What do you think of the attached water quality report for the website? It includes, as requested, a summary of the COPC data from the first week of dredging to be posted on the website.

Also, attached is proposed language to modify the air monitoring frequency during the remainder of dredging and capping. Look forward to your review of both.

Stan Kaczmarek, PE

de maximis, inc.

186 Center Street, Suite 290

Clinton, NJ 08809

(O) (908) 735-9315

(C) (973) 978-9621